Man verily is formed of desire; as his desire is, so is his will; as his will is, so he works; and whatever work he does, in the likeness of it he grows.

—*The Upanishads*


# THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 60 JULY, 1972 NUMBER 9


## THE IDENTITY OF MAN

THE books embodying the Theosophical philosophy will have been written to no purpose unless it is realized that a "deeper realization of the Self" is indeed the purpose of all of man's psychological and philosophical exploration. Human thought cannot rise higher than the idea held of the self permits, and action is but the effect of thought. If we take seriously what is said in the writings of both H. P. Blavatsky and William Q. Judge concerning the present cycle, the fundamental cause of the restlessness of the times—beneath all the immediate and superficial reasons—is the reaching of countless egos after a more satisfactory explanation of who and what they are. "Identity" is already a catch-word of the times, and the ills which beset many men are traceable to the frustration of inner longings which are continually misunderstood and grossly misinterpreted by authorities who have only the doctrines of a confining materialism as their resource.

*The Secret Doctrine* as a book contains both a metaphysics and a history concerned with the identity of human beings. It speaks directly to the wondering spirit of man, that which in him moves great poets to exclaim at the splendors of what they are able to imagine, and what, sometimes, they feel themselves to be. Yet there is no one who does not, on some occasion, experience this sense of grandeur, this touch with divinity, even though, from a heavy weight of mortal hours, it may fall too soon into melancholy and suffer denial.

It is a teaching of great philosophers that the world and the lives

of men can be transformed by a deepening sense of the reality of this inner being, whose voice, in our time, seems heard so seldom, yet whose presence surely accounts for the turbulent revolts of the age, the agonized perfectionism of so much of human striving, and the wild imaginings which might have profound meanings were they ever to obtain disciplined form. But there is evidence enough in all human experience that we have not only to feel, but also to *think,* our way to truth. *The Secret Doctrine* was written as a means of helping the humanity of this age to think its way to conscious self-knowledge, for man is a complex being, not only a spiritual essence, a center of awareness. He has powers and capacities which correspond to every department of nature, and most significant of all, he is a mind with the potentiality of grasping the relationships of all that goes to make up both himself and the world.

Early in the second volume of *The Secret Doctrine* (p. 88), in the midst of a detailed account of the various "creators" that help to bring into being man as we know him, H.P.B. pauses and exclaims:

> How precise and true is Plato's expression, how profound and philosophical his remark on the (human) soul or EGO, when he defined it as "a compound of the *same* and the *other.*" And yet how little this hint has been understood, since the world took it to mean that the soul was the breath of God, of Jehovah. It is "the *same* and the *other,*" as the great Initiate-Philosopher said; for the EGO (the "Higher Self" when merged with and in the Divine Monad) is Man, and yet the *same* as the "OTHER," the Angel in him incarnated, as the same with the universal MAHAT. The great classics and philosophers felt this truth, when saying that "there must be something within us which produces our thoughts. Something very subtle; it is a breath; it is fire; it is ether; it is quintessence; it is a slender likeness; it is an intellection; it is a number; it is harmony. . . ." (*Voltaire*).

Even in this brief passage it becomes clear that man is indeed an embodiment of Universal Mind, a ray of the great Mahat, the mind principle of the universe, the very stuff from which all the gods are made. Again and again this idea is repeated:

> What is human mind in its higher aspect, whence comes it, if it is not a portion of the essence—and, in some rare cases of incarnation, the *very essence*—of a higher Being: one from a higher and divine plane? Can man—a god in animal form—be the product of Material Nature by evolution alone, even as is the animal, which differs from man in external shape, but by no means in the materials of its physical fabric, and is informed

> by the same, though undeveloped, Monad—seeing that the intellectual potentialities of the two differ as the Sun does from the Glow-worm? And what is it that creates such difference, unless man is an animal *plus* a *living god* within his physical shell? Let us pause and ask ourselves seriously the question, regardless of the vagaries and sophisms of both the materialistic and the psychological modern sciences. (II, 81.)

When one thinks of the burdens which the present humanity has laid upon the future, it becomes entirely reasonable to conclude that only a race of gods—or at least gods in the making—could measure up to the tasks of reconstruction and regeneration which lie ahead. What is needed, for the sake of all, is a generation which grows ready to accept the high responsibilities of the Promethean mission, and how could this be possible save through dawning recognition that this *is* the human destiny—that men are indeed Promethean spirits, gods in exile, beings whose very nature it is to work with all their hearts and all their minds for the benefit of the entire creation?

One great lesson of *The Secret Doctrine,* then, is that the great Saviours, the sacrificers, the creative spirits who come as teachers and pioneers, are archetypal representatives of *ourselves;* they are a symbolic projection of our own potentialities as well as historical realities.

*The Secret Doctrine* is a large book filled with great detail for the reason that it addresses the human capacity to know at every level of man's cognitive principles. It meets the desire for explanation on every plane. It embodies the logical and symmetrical persuasions of metaphysics, the practical explanations for which the intellect hungers, while its mystical portions have power to awaken the intuition. It is a book which engages the whole mind and deals with the major works of the mind by eminent thinkers of the past, those who have pursued similar inquiries. And all this to the end of schooling the reader who would also be disciple to begin to think of himself in the terms which the Secret Doctrine suggests—so that finally, when he awakens each morning, his first thought will have resonance with the vast, universal purpose of the awakening of the universe—so that he will begin to think of himself, even now, here on earth, as a potential god with a godlike destiny to fulfill.

# HIDDEN HINTS IN THE SECRET DOCTRINE

*(From p. 67 to p. 128, Vol. I)*

MATTER DURING PRALAYA. It is in a state of great tenuity seen only by Bodhisatvas. When evolution begins again it appears like curds in space. Vol. I, p. 69.

ELECTRICITY AN ENTITY. Vol I, p. 76, line 6; it is an emanation from an entity of power, p. 111, note; and is coexistent with the one life, p. 81; it is primordial matter of a special nature, p. 82.

PULSATION OF THE HEART AND THE TIDES. Probably due to the universal expanding and contracting of the atoms, which in turn are caused by the expansion and contraction of matter of space. Vol. I, p. 84. "There is heat internal and heat external in every atom." *Id.*

TWO SORTS OF FIRE OR HEAT. One in the central Sun and the other in the manifested universe and solar system. Vol. I, 84, 87.

MAGICAL POTENCY OF WORDS is in the vowel sounds and not in the numbers. Vol. I, 94.

THE TERM "HUMAN" IS NOT TO BE CONFINED TO THIS GLOBE. It must be applied to all entities who have reached the fourth stage of development on any planet in space in its fourth round in any chain of planets. Vol. I, p. 106, 2nd par.

BUDDHI AS COMPARED WITH SPIRIT is material, although for us and the highest conceptions we can form it is wholly beyond materiality. Vol. I, p. 119, line 7.

THE HUMAN MONAD is the union of the ray from the absolute with the soul. Vol. I, p. 119, 1st par.

SYMBOLISM AND NUMBERS. They are intimately connected with the hosts of the Dhyan-Chohans. The basic numbers refer each to distinct groups of ideas which vary according to the group of Dhyan Chohans referred to. In other places the author says that, as the Dhyani are connected with evolution in all its intricacies and mysteries, it follows that symbolism is of the highest importance. Vol. I, p. 119 (b).

---

NOTE.—The first part of this article by Mr. Judge was printed in the *Path*, February, 1891; the second part, in March, 1891.

THE ONE FUNDAMENTAL LAW OF OCCULT SCIENCE is the radical unity of the ultimate essence of each constituent part of compounds in nature from star to atom and from the highest Dhyan Chohan to the smallest infusoria. And this is to be applied spiritually, intellectually, and physically. Vol. I. p. 120, last par.

KARMA NEEDS MATERIAL AGENCIES to carry out its decrees. Vol. I, p. 123, line 2. The material agents spoken of here are not merely those that we class as such, but many others which are generally conceived of by us as spiritual. For, as said above, even Buddhi is material when compared with Atman of which it is the vehicle. The clue here given is in regard to the operations of Karma through the atoms that are used by the egos in their various incarnations. But in following this out it must not be forgotten that there is no particle or point of materiality which is not at the same time mixed with or in company with another particle—if the word may be used for this purpose—of spirit or the one life.

THE THREE GROUPS OF BUILDERS. These are as follows: The first is the group which constructs the entire system as a whole and which includes more than this globe system; the second is the group of builders who come in when the system as a great whole is ready and form the planetary chain of this earth; and the third is that group which builds or projects Humanity, as they are the great type of the microcosm—man. Vol. I, p. 128, second par.

THE LIPIKA AS COMPARED WITH THE BUILDERS are the great Spirits of the universe as a whole, the builders being of a special nature. The Lipika, like the others, are divided into three groups, but it is asserted that only the lowest of these three groups has to do with this system of ours and that the other two cannot be known, and also that those two are so high that it is doubtful if even the highest of the Adepts know about them. It may therefore be supposed that for the Adepts the Lipika of the higher degrees are as great a mystery as the Mahatmas are for us, and that this ascending scale of greatness ever gives to the soul something still higher, no matter how far it may progress, to which to look and aspire. Vol. I, see whole of page 128.

But as each of the three groups is divided into seven others (p. 127), it may be the 21st sub-group which has to do with this globe; and it is said that as to the highest of the groups it is directly connected with our karma. Vol. I, p. 128, last line. Now as Karma rules the entire universe, it must follow, in order to make and keep

harmony, that the "highest grade of Lipika" referred to on page 128 is not the highest of the last series of 21 sub-groups, but the highest of the whole three great groups.

NOTE WELL. Whenever an "entity" is spoken of among the various "hosts" it is to be known as composed of many entities, just as man himself is similarly constituted, his total consciousness being that of the whole mass of beings who go to make up his intricate life.

*(From p. 128 to p. 160, Vol. I.)*

NIRMANAKAYAS. First reference to these on p. 132, note, where they are called "the surviving spiritual principles of men," and in the text they are those who *reincarnate for the good of the world* if they choose.

ELECTRICITY AGAIN is mentioned as *Life,* p. 137, 4th line; also p. 139, line 17; also a form of "Fohat"; also p. 145 (b).

ETHER only partially manifested, and not to be fully so until the 5th round, p. 140.

THAT ENTITIES ARE CONSTITUTED of many units, each an entity. Thus that "Fohat," elsewhere called "an Entity," is not one undivided entity but is made up of others; and that there are as many Fohats as there are worlds. Note 2, p. 143, and p. 145 (b).

ELIXIR OF LIFE. A hint thereupon. Note 2, p. 144.

ELEMENTALS CONCERNED in all forces, *e.g.,* that electricity, magnetism, cohesion, and the like, are made up of elementals. These, of course, are not all of one class, but of several, p. 146. Near the end of this page it is inferentially stated that elementals are generated in millions by other beings. This must be, in fact, a transforming process in the atoms. By referring to p. 143 a broad hint will be found as to this in the remarks upon the "fate of an atom" once caught into any world sphere, and the means of getting out through "a current of efflux." Is this *efflux* through the transforming being?

THE MOON. In what sense dead? Only as to her inner principles. Her physical principles are not dead, but have a certain activity, p. 149, note I. And her spiritual principles have been transferred to this earth, p. 155, note, and p. 156, line 6.

DISAPPEARANCE OF THE MOON will have occurred before this earth has passed through her 7th human round, p. 155, note.

ARCHETYPAL MAN ON GLOBE A. p. 159, last par. Here is a

most interesting hint not often referred to and opening up a vista of thought. In the 1st round of the monads in this chain of planets, the monads from the preceding chain of worlds—say the moon's chain—*become human beings* on Globe A. But in the 2nd round the process alters, and it is in the 4th round that man appears on this earth, the 4th Globe. To quote: "on globe A man rebecomes a mineral, a plant, an animal, on globe B, C, etc. The process changes entirely from the 2nd round, but—" This abruptness is to give the hint to intuitional investigators, and opens up as great a problem as the 8th sphere seemed once to be and still perhaps is. But we may ask if on Globe A—unseen by us—the archetypal process does not obtain?

—W.Q.J.

---

## Non-discriminating Discrimination

Nothing of that which is conducive to help man, collectively or individually, to live—not "happily"—but less *unhappily* in this world, ought to be indifferent to the Theosophist-Occultist. It is no concern of his whether his help benefits a man in his *worldly* or *spiritual* progress; his first duty is to be ever ready to help if he can, without stopping to philosophize. It is because our clerical and lay Pharisees too often offer a Christian tract, instead of the simple bread of life to the wretches they meet—whether these are striving physically or morally—that pessimism, materialism and despair win with every day more ground in our age. Weal and woe, or happiness and misery, are relative terms. Each of us finds them according to his or her predilections; one in worldly, the other in intellectual pursuits, and no one system will ever satisfy all. Hence, while one finds his pleasure and rest in family joys, another in "Socialism" and the third in a "longing only for eternal peace," there may be those who are starving for truth, in every department of the science of nature, and who consequently are yearning to learn the esoteric views about "cosmology, the evolution of man and of the Universe."

—H. P. Blavatsky

# INDIVIDUALITY AND PERSONALITY

> Our beliefs are all founded on that immortal individuality. But then, like so many others, you confuse *personality* with individuality. . . . Yet it is precisely that difference which gives the keynote to the understanding of Eastern philosophy.
>
> —*The Key to Theosophy*

THE teaching of Theosophy on the difference between the individuality and the personality, stated here by H. P. Blavatsky, and in many other places in the literature, is made unmistakably clear. Why, then, the "confusion" between the two, which is indeed a common error, as H.P.B. suggests?

The light of self-consciousness, we know, comes from the higher ego, the spark of potential divinity, the ray of Universal Mind. Man, we are taught, is a son of Mahat. This spark or ray *is* the enduring soul or ego, and like the actor who plays Macbeth, Romeo, and Hamlet on successive nights at the theatre, the individual takes on different personalities in its many incarnations.

The sense of "I," then, comes from this individuality, not from the personalities of Mr. Jones or Mr. Smith. But if this is the case, why do men cling so desperately to quite another feeling of their identity? Why do they fear death? Why does the status of the successful businessman, honored professional person, happy parent or spouse, mean so much to them, leading, sometimes, to a total abandonment of regard for the pain of others, or even their lives? Where does this *other* sense of self come from?

This is a way of asking what is the basis in human life of what has been called the "moral struggle." We are not left without an answer by the Theosophical philosophy. As the ancient *Bhagavad-Gita* puts it:

> For spirit when invested with matter or *prakriti* experienceth the qualities which proceed from *prakriti;* its connection with these qualities is the cause of its rebirth in good or evil wombs.

Then, in *The Secret Doctrine* (I, 292), there is a passage which speaks of the power of the mind "when placed under the influence or control of material conditions." Through the mind under these conditions, it is said, we form persisting connections between the

sensations brought by experience of the external world, thus generating the notion of external objects; and similarly, by the mysterious link of memory, we generate "the notion of self or individuality." Thus the *power* of the mind comes from the ego, but its use under material conditions creates the personal idea of the self, which seems to us dependent upon the embodiment we are now experiencing. Naturally enough, this view of human identity or selfhood has been adopted by Western psychology. John Dewey put the conception quite clearly in *Human Nature and Conduct*:

> There is no one ready-made self behind activities. There are complex, unstable, opposing attitudes, habits, impulses which gradually come to terms with one another, and assume a certain consistency of configuration, even though only by means of a distribution of inconsistencies which keeps them in water-tight compartments, giving them separate turns or tricks in action.

This, one might say, is the conclusion reached by a searching and acute intelligence, simply from observation of human behavior, and of the subjective states of the ordinary man, when the mind, "under the influence or control of material conditions," has found no reason to inquire into the possibilities suggested by antique philosophical tradition, or is insusceptible to those glimmerings of vision which come to poets and other intuitive individuals. With these realities in mind, one can easily understand the observation of Mr. Judge in the second volume of *Letters That Have Helped Me*:

> When the self is first seen, it is like looking into a glove; and for how many incarnations may it not be so? The material envelope throws up before the eye of the Soul waving fumes and clouds of illusion.

Is there anyone truly free of all these distractions and sources of error? Perhaps, if we took Wordsworth's "Intimations of Immortality" as an ideal example of the inspiration which may come to a musing human spirit—one who has through discipline and search refined his vehicles to the point of at least a little clarity for the vision of higher manas on this plane—we might have some idea of how the great ideas of soul and impersonal spiritual reality are kept alive in cultural tradition, as distinguished from the direct efforts of the Theosophical Movement to plant the seeds of true ideas.

What is the purpose of philosophy, from the viewpoint of the great teachers of mankind? It is to help aspiring members of the race to free themselves from the personal idea—from a false sense of self. One of the means by which this may be accomplished is

through a broad understanding of the constitution of man's nature —what he is in both the embodied and disembodied states. A mind schooled in teachings of this sort has not only the possible inspiration of inner intuitions, but also the help of elementary principles of self-knowledge, in intellectual terms, *on this plane,* so that, little by little, his everyday ideas and behavior will constitute less of an obstacle to the voice of the Higher Man.

What, then, forms the personality? In infancy begins the slowly growing awareness that each one is or uses a body, separate from other bodies. This is the initial sense of separateness, later reinforced by cultural influences which stress other differences and lay the ground for various sorts of egotism, based on class, nation, and race. There is also, in our time, the scientific materialism which includes the idea of the survival of the fittest in the struggle for existence. These conceptions, which so largely shape the institutions of the age, now saturating orthodox education, combine to support the aggressive selfishness which is seen by some modern theorists as the means to both survival and "success" in a competitive world.

It is at least potentially weakening to this complex of beliefs about the nature of man to have instruction in a philosophy which teaches that the resulting "personality" is a synthetic consciousness reflecting various mortal qualities and motives which will dissolve at death. Only the higher man, the higher mind, survives, taking with it what there is of growth and expression in its own qualities from the now defunct personality; although all the tendencies, good and bad, will be reassembled in the new embodiment of the ego at the time of its next incarnation. Then there will be a new personality, but the same individuality will again strive to penetrate the mask of misconception.

However, in the nature of the personality, there is another stream of influence. The Ego, source of the feeling of Self, is a ray of the Universal Mind. On its own plane, it knows itself related to all other "rays," as "sons of one sweet mother." This feeling has nothing to do with selfishness. It is an independence that is at the same time cooperation, mutual help through a life and work that benefit all. When the higher ego is incarnated in a body, from this source there filters into the personal consciousness such feelings as friendliness, generosity, kindness, love; it is the inspirer of idealism and devotion; the leaven of higher impulses in our human nature.

Our age has produced great power through scientific knowl-

edge. But judging from the misery, discontent, and eruptive violence in the world, it has not only failed to achieve human happiness, but has added diabolical methods vastly extending "man's inhumanity to man." While economic and political panaceas emerge as "solutions," implicit in them all is the accepted rule of separateness. And since action from this basis cannot fail to be hurtful to somebody else, we have here the basic cause of the world's troubled condition.

Both new opportunities and new problems are now arising among us. As said by H.P.B.: "The latent psychic and occult powers in man are beginning to germinate and grow. Psychic capacities held perfectly under control, checked and directed by the Manasic principle, are valuable aids in development. But these capacities running riot, controlling instead of controlled, lead the Student into the most dangerous delusions and the certainty of moral destruction. It was the fearful misuse of magic by the Atlanteans that led the race to utter destruction."

Many are those who today flock to "occult groups," hoping to find fulfillment of their longings by some mysterious means. But the motives of the past persist in the expectation of easy accomplishment, without either knowledge or discipline. So there is often scoffing at the insistence of the teachers of Theosophy on the importance of *first* defusing the explosive tendency of self-seeking. Yet this is no novel counsel. Long ago, Jesus counseled his followers, "But rather seek ye the kingdom of God; and all these things shall be added unto you." And in the *Gita,* Krishna exhorts Arjuna to rise above the three qualities which animate his personal nature.

In our own time, there are these words of H.P.B.: "Selfishness is the impassable wall between the *personal* Self and Truth." The work of each one is indicated by Mr. Judge in *The Ocean of Theosophy*: "By living according to the dictates of the soul the brain may at last be made porous to the soul's recollections."

---

In each human being is a complete universe in which daily occur phenomena that should be studied.

*—The Path*

# *letters • questions • comment*

*A good education might be summed up as the process of becoming independent. But what does this mean in a universe of interdependent beings?*

A distinction ought to be made between independence, *per se*, and independent thinking. In the education of children the question of independence is of primary importance. It implies the gradual individualization of consciousness, in cyclic progression, beginning with birth and proceeding in fairly well defined intervals thereafter. We might consequently expect there to be alternations through which the emerging intelligence periodically separates itself from a protective environment in order to move into a wider field where more can be learned. Ideally, the individual would be propelled into a new condition by the growth that has taken place, making the old one no longer adequate. But if the primary purpose of incarnation is the experience of the indwelling ego, independence must have a significance greater than the more or less predictable development of the personality. In the alternation between dependent and independent conditions, the individual may see himself as first identified with the conditions, then later as separating from them, in somewhat the same way as a baby first becomes aware of himself as a body, then as the user of that body. As he gradually realizes this, he ceases to be a passive experiencer of these alternations and assumes a measure of command over them.

This process repeats itself throughout childhood on different levels of awareness. The individual emerges into adulthood with whatever development of his faculties his past Karma makes available, and with whatever mastery his self-awareness as a distinct entity will permit. When he comes to understand this process of incarnation well enough to *use* his powers at will, yet realize that he is not defined or limited by them, he is indeed master. He has not "separated" himself from anything, really, but only from the delusion that he *is* any one of these forms. If the mental and physical acts by which he dispels this delusion are done out of concern for life as a whole, they generate a strength which is not separative.

because it does not rest on egotism or the weaknesses of others. The strength which he desires, he desires for all others as well.

Few, it seems, arrive at the threshold of adulthood in this philosophically integrated state. One reason for this is suggested by a passage by Mr. Judge in *Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita*:

> Man, made of thought, occupant only of many bodies from time to time, is eternally thinking. His chains are through thought, his release due to nothing else. His mind is immediately tinted or altered by whatever object it is directed to. By this means the soul is enmeshed in the same thought or series of thoughts as is the mind. If the object be anything that is distinct from the Supreme Self then the mind is at once turned into that, becomes that, is tinted like that. This is one of the natural capacities of the mind. It is naturally clear and uncolored, as we would see if we were able to find one that had not gone through too many experiences. It is moveable and quick, having a disposition to bound from one point to another. Several words would describe it. Chameleon-like it changes color, sponge-like it absorbs that to which it is applied, sieve-like it at once loses its former color and shape the moment a different object is taken up. Thus, full of joy from an appropriate cause, it may suddenly become gloomy. We can therefore say it becomes that to which it is devoted.

In other words, childhood is much more than a developmental process. It is literally the gathering together of the five senses and the mind by the Ego. Included in this is the whole range of mental and physical intelligences or "lives" of various grades which he has in the past influenced in one way or another. By understanding these lesser intelligences and coming to terms with them, he will forge his own independence while contributing to their evolution.

To this end, therefore, the best education would be that which fosters the powers and strengths of the child and at the same time encourages growing independence of the system of assumption or belief which has afforded this protection while it was needed. It is not merely because that system is faulty that this rejection must take place. It may in fact be very good for its purposes. Perhaps, even, the better it is, the more insistent will be the child's independence when the proper time comes, because of his maturing awareness that he can now evolve systems of his own. Fostering this kind of growth to individuality is constructively accomplished by the example of the teacher who constantly searches for ways to enlarge his own horizon. The teacher needs to encourage in the student the idea that he is quite literally the Chooser, the Experi-

encer, the Knower of all things that come to him, and that this is true in an ultimate sense as well as in immediate ways, in our circumscribed lives. The learner is thus the charioteer as well as the warrior, having recognized Krishna as present within.

*What of the lower mind survives death and becomes part of the permanent ego?*

It is said in the teachings of Theosophy that mind is one, becoming dual in incarnation. Some of the elements comprising the lower mind seem easily identifiable as the ideas that are held about life, including the entire bundle of impressions which are often assumed to be all there is to a human being. It also seems evident that the lower mind is influenced by the mental, psychic, and physical environment which Karma imposes on the reincarnating Ego. In other words, the lower mind provides the ego with points of contact with its environment. In *The Key to Theosophy* the distinction between lower and higher mind is described:

> We distinguish between the simple fact of self-consciousness, the simple feeling that "I am I," and the complex thought that "I am Mr. Smith" or "Mrs. Brown." Believing as we do in a series of births for the same Ego, or re-incarnation, this distinction is the fundamental pivot of the whole idea. You see "Mr. Smith" really means a long series of daily experiences strung together by the thread of memory, and forming what Mr. Smith calls "himself." But none of these "experiences" are really the "I" or the Ego, nor do they give "Mr. Smith" the feeling that he is himself, for he forgets the greater part of his daily experiences, and they produce the feeling of *Egoity* in him only while they last. We Theosophists, therefore, distinguish between this bundle of "experiences," which we call the *false* (because so finite and evanescent) *personality*, and that element in man to which the feeling of "I am I" is due. It is this "I am I" which we call the *true* individuality; and we say that this "Ego" or individuality plays, like an actor, many parts on the stage of life.

This means that what happens during a lifetime—to what extent the life is an opportunity for growth, or a scourge to the personal man, or merely a waste of time—depends upon whether the individual tries to open up the lower mind to influence from the higher. Then, after death, the reincarnating ego will assimilate whatever of earthly consciousness is homogeneous with its own nature. There might not seem in daily life to be a clearly marked division between the two aspects of mind, but the polarity must exist, and the highest aspects of lower mind would blend with the higher ego during life

and be consolidated after death, when the higher assimilates the harvest of the cycle of incarnation. And this same process, one might suppose, would be repeated in the numberless smaller cycles of day-to-day existence, such as the alternation between sleeping and waking consciousness.

But how might qualities that can be assimilated by the ego be described? The higher ego is eternal and is said to be quasi-omniscient on its own plane. Anything, therefore, of the personality that is assimilable to the incarnating ego must be the fruit of thoughts and acts which reach beyond the personal self as an objective. It would surely include those perceptions which see things in terms of their potential wholeness, instead of their finite dimensions.

All efforts to live generously and courageously, without self-interest, would generate the stuff of immortality. *The Voice of the Silence* speaks of the importance of daring to the disciple, and reminds him that Self-knowledge, the most enduring of attainments, "is of loving deeds the child." All this, however, has to do with the use he makes of experience, not with the experiences themselves. The lower mind, then, may be regarded as the *tool* of distinctively human evolution. As it is made increasingly aware of universal principles, it may become the bridge by which the higher mind gains effective entry to terrestrial life. In this way the materials through which growth is accomplished are raised up to immortality.

---

## THE INNER RELIANCE

The sincere desire to help others acts as a great inlet from our supersensuous consciousness. More reliance on our inner nature, and the power that is conjoined with it, will bring forth fruit. Always the inner is the more perfect, and this makes the apparent imperfections and inabilities of the outer more obvious; but this very perception arouses the necessary effort to bring the inner and outer into accord.

—ROBERT CROSBIE

# "THEOSOPHIST" EDITORIAL NOTES

## Is the Sun Merely a Cooling Mass?

THE "Adepts," who are thus forced to demolish before they can reconstruct, deny most emphatically (*a*) that the Sun is in combustion, in any ordinary sense of the word; or (*b*) that he is *incandescent* or even *burning* though he is *glowing;* or (*c*) that his luminosity has already begun to weaken and his power of combustion may be exhausted within a given and conceivable time; or even (*d*) that his chemical and physical constitution contains any of the elements of terrestrial chemistry in any of the states that either chemist or physicist is acquainted with. With reference to the latter, they add that, properly speaking, though the body of the Sun—a body that was never yet reflected by telescope or spectroscope that man invented—cannot be said to be constituted of those terrestrial elements with the state of which the chemist is familiar, yet that these elements are all present in the sun's outward robes, and a host more of elements unknown so far to science.

There seems little need, indeed, to have waited so long for the lines belonging to these respective elements to correspond with dark lines of the solar spectrum to *know* that no element present on our earth could ever be possibly found wanting in the sun; although, on the other hand, there are many others in the sun which have either not reached or not as yet been discovered on our globe. Some may be missing in certain stars and heavenly bodies still in the process of formation; or, properly speaking, though present in them, these elements on account of their undeveloped state may not respond as yet to the usual scientific tests. But how can the earth possess that which the Sun has never had? The "Adepts" affirm as a fact that the true *Sun*—an invisible orb of which the known one is the shell, mask, or clothing—has in him the spirit of every element that exists in the solar system; and his "Chromosphere," as Mr. Lockyer named it, has the same, only in a far more developed condition though still in a state unknown on earth; our planet having to await its further growth and development before any of its elements can be reduced to the condition they are in within that

---

Note.—This excerpt from "Reply to an English F.T.S.," originally appeared in the *Theosophist*, September, 1883.

chromosphere. Nor can the substance producing the coloured light in the latter be properly called solid, liquid, or even "gaseous," as now supposed, for it is neither. Thousands of years before Leverrier and Padri Secchi, the old Aryans sung of *Soorya*. . . . "hiding behind his *Yogi*[1] robes his head that no one could see"; the ascetic's dress being, as all know, dyed expressly into a red-yellow hue, a colouring matter with pinkish patches on it, rudely representing the vital principle in man's blood—the symbol of the *vital principle* in the sun, or what is now called chromosphere. The "rose-colored region"! How little astronomers will ever know of its real nature even though hundreds of eclipses furnish them with the *indisputable evidence* of its presence. The sun is so thickly surrounded by a *shell* of this "red matter," that it is useless for them to speculate with only the help of their physical instruments, upon the nature of that which they can never see or detect with mortal eye behind that brilliant, *radiant* zone of matter. . . .

If the "Adepts" are asked: "What then, in your views, is the nature of our sun and what is there beyond that cosmic veil?"—they answer: *beyond* rotates and beats the *heart and head* of our system; externally is spread its robe, the nature of which is not matter, whether solid, liquid, or gaseous, such as you are acquainted with, but *vital* electricity, condensed and made visible.[2] And if the statement is objected to on the grounds that were the luminosity of the sun due to any other cause than *combustion* and *flame*, no physical law of which Western Science has any knowledge, could account

---

[1] There is an interesting story in the Puranas relating to this subject. The Devas, it would appear, asked the great Rishi Vasishta to bring the Sun into Satya Loka. The Rishi there went and requested the Sun-god to do so. The Sun-god replied that all the worlds would be destroyed if he were to leave his place. The Rishi then offered to place his red-coloured cloth (*Kashay Vastram*) in the place of the Sun's disk and did so. The visible body of the Sun is this robe of Vasishta, it would seem.—T. Subba Row (*Acting Editor*).

[2] If the "English F.T.S." would take the trouble of consulting p. 11 of the "Magis Adamica" of Eugenius Philalethes his learned compatriot, he would find therein the difference between a visible and an invisible planet as clearly hinted at as it was safe to do at a time when the iron claw of orthodoxy had the power as well as disposition, to tear the flesh from heretic bones. "The earth is invisible"—says he—. . . "and which is more, the *eye of man never saw the earth*, nor can it be *seen* without *art*. To make this element visible is *the greatest secret in magic*. . . . As for this feculent, gross body upon which we walk, it is a *compost*, and no earth but *it hath earth in it* . . . in a word all the *elements are visible* but *one*, namely, the *earth;* and when thou hast attained to so much *perfection* as to know why *God* hath placed the *earth in abscondito* thou hast an excellent figure whereby to know *God himself*, and how he is *visible*, how *invisible*." The italics are the author's, it being the custom of the Alchemists to emphasize those words which had a double meaning in their code. Here "God himself" *visible* and *invisible*, relates to their *lapis philosophorum*—Nature's seventh principle.

for the existence of such intensely high temperature of the sun *without combustion;* that such a temperature, besides burning with its light and flame every visible thing in our universe, would show its luminosity of a homogeneous and uniform intensity throughout, which it does not; that undulations and disturbances in the photosphere, the growing of the "protuberances," and a fierce raging of elements in combustion have been observed in the sun, with their tongues of fire and spots exhibiting every appearance of cyclonic motion, and "solar storms," etc., etc.; to this the only answer that can be given is the following: the appearances are all there, yet it is not combustion.

Undoubtedly were the "robes," the dazzling drapery which now envelopes the whole of the sun's globe withdrawn, or even "the shining atmosphere *which permits us to see the sun*" (as Sir William Herschel thought) removed so as to allow one trifling rent—our whole universe would be reduced to ashes. *Jupiter Fulminator* revealing himself to his beloved would incinerate her instantly. But it can never be. The protecting shell is of a thickness, and at a distance from the universal HEART that can hardly be ever calculated by your mathematicians. And how can they hope to see the sun's *inner* body once that the existence of that "chromosphere" is ascertained, though its actual density may be still unknown, when one of the greatest, if not *the* greatest of their authorities—Sir W. Herschel—says the following: "The sun, also, has its *atmosphere,* and if some of the fluids which enter into its composition should be of a shining brilliancy, while others are merely transparent, *any temporory cause which may remove the lucid fluid will permit us to see the body of the sun* through the transparent ones." The underlined words written nearly 80 years ago embody the wrong hypothesis that the *body of the sun* might be seen under such circumstances, whereas it is only the far away layers of "the lucid fluid" that would be perceived. And what the great astronomer adds invalidates entirely the first portion of his assumption. "If an observer were placed on the moon, he would see the solid body of our earth *only in those places where the transparent fluids of the atmosphere would permit him.* In others, the opaque vapors would reflect the light of the sun without permitting his view to penetrate to the surface of our globe." Thus, if the atmosphere of our earth, which in its relation to the "atmosphere" (?) of the sun is like the tenderest skin of a fruit compared with the thickest husk of a cocoanut, would prevent the

eye of an observer standing on the moon to penetrate everywhere "to the surface of our globe," how can an astronomer ever hope his sight to penetrate to the *sun's* surface, from our earth and at a distance of from 85 to 95 million miles,[3] whereas the moon, we are told, is only about 238,000 miles! The proportionately larger size of the sun does not bring him any nearer with the scope of our physical vision.

Truly remarks Sir W. Herschel that the sun "has been called a globe of fire, *perhaps metaphorically"!* It has been *supposed* that the dark spots were solid bodies revolving near the sun's surface. "They have been *conjectured* to be the smoke of volcanoes . . . the scum floating upon an ocean of fluid matter. . . . They have been *taken* for clouds . . . *explained* to be opaque masses swimming in the *fluid matter* of the sun. . . ." Alone, of all astronomers, Sir John Herschel, whose *intuition* was still greater than his great learning, came—all anthropomorphic conceptions set aside—far nearer truth than any of those modern astronomers who, while admiring his gigantic learning, smile at his "imaginative and fanciful theories." His only mistake, now shared by most astronomers, was that he regarded the "opaque body" occasionally observed through the curtain of his "luminous envelope" as the sun itself. When saying in the course of his speculations upon the Nasmyth willow-leaf theory: —"the definite shape of these objects; their exact similarity one to another. . . . all these characters seem quite repugnant to the notion of their being of a vaporous, a cloudy, or a fluid nature"—his spiritual intuition served him better than his remarkable knowledge of physical science. When he adds: "Nothing remains but to consider them *as separate and independent sheets,* flakes. . . . . having *some sort of solidity* . . . . . Be they what they may, they are evidently *the immediate sources of the solar light and heat"*—he utters a grander physical truth than was ever uttered by any living astronomer. And, when furthermore, we find him postulating—"looked at in this point of view, we cannot refuse to regard them as *organisms* of some peculiar and amazing kind; and though it would be too daring to speak of such organization as partaking of the nature of life, yet *we do know that vital action is competent to develop at once heat, and light, and electricity,"* Sir John Herschel gives out a theory approximating an occult truth more than any profane ever

---

[3] Verily—*"absolute accuracy* in the solution of this problem (of distances between the heavenly bodies and the earth) *is simply out of question!"*

did with regard to solar physics.

These "wonderful objects" are not, as a modern astronomer interprets Sir. J. Herschel's words. *"solar inhabitants,* whose fiery constitution enables them to illuminate, warm and electricise the whole solar system," but simply the reservoirs of solar vital energy, the *vital* electricity that feeds the whole system in which it lives, and breathes, and has its being. It is, as we say, the store-house of our little cosmos, self-generating its vital fluid, and ever receiving as much as it gives out. Were the astronomers to be asked—what definite and positive fact exists at the root of their solar theory;—what knowledge they have of solar combustion and atmosphere—they might, perchance, feel embarrassed when confronted with all their present theories. For, it is sufficient to make a *résumé* of what the solar physicists *do not know,* to gain conviction that they are as far as ever from a definite knowledge of the constitution and ultimate nature of the heavenly bodies. We may, perhaps, be permitted to enumerate:—

Beginning with, as Mr. Proctor wisely calls it, "the wildest assumption possible," that there is, in accordance with the law of analogy, some general resemblance between the materials in, and the processes at work upon the Sun, and those materials with which terrestrial chemistry and physics are familiar, what is that sum of results achieved by spectroscopic and other analyses of the surface and the inner constitution of the sun, which warrants any one in establishing the *axiom* of the Sun's combustion and gradual extinction? They have no means, as they themselves daily confess, of experimenting upon, hence of determining the sun's physical condition; for (*a*) they are ignorant of the atmospheric limits; (*b*) even though it were proved that *matter,* such as they know of, is continuously falling upon the sun, being ignorant of its real velocity and the nature of the material it falls upon, they are unable "to discuss the effect of motions wholly surpassing in velocity . . . . . enormously exceeding even the inconceivable velocity of many meteors"; (*c*) confessedly—they "have no means of learning whence that part of the light comes which gives the continuous spectrum" . . . . , hence no means of determining how great a depth of the solar substance is concerned in sending out that light. This light "may come from the surface layers only"; and, "it may be but a shell. . . . . " (truly!); and finally, (*d*) they have yet to learn "how far combustion, properly so called, can take place within the Sun's

mass"; and "whether these processes, which we (they) recognize as combustion are the only processes of combustion which can actually take place there." Therefore, Mr. Proctor for one comes to the happy and prudent idea after all "that what had been supposed the most marked characteristic of incandescent solid and liquid bodies, is thus shown to be a possible characteristic of the light of the glowing gas." Thus, the whole basis of their reasoning having been shaken (by Frankland's objection), they, the astronomers, may yet arrive at accepting the occult theory, viz., that they have to look to the 6th state of matter, for divulging to them the true nature of their photospheres, chromospheres, appendages, prominences, projections and horns. Indeed, when one finds the greatest authority of the age in physical science—Prof. Tyndall—saying that "no earthly substance with which we are acquainted—no substance which the fall of meteors has landed on the earth—*would be at all competent to maintain* the Sun's combustion"; and again: —". . . multiplying all our powers by millions of millions, we do not reach the Sun's expenditure. And still, notwithstanding this enormous drain in the lapse of human history, we are unable to detect a diminution of his store . . ."—after reading this, to see the men of science maintaining still their theory of "a hot globe cooling," one may be excused for feeling surprised at such inconsistency. Verily is that great physicist right in viewing the sun himself as "a speck in infinite extension—a mere drop in the Universal sea"; and saying that, "to nature nothing can be added; from nature nothing can be taken away; the sum of her energy is constant, and the utmost man can do in the pursuit of physical truth, or in the applications of physical knowledge, *is to shift the constituents of the never-varying total. The law of conservation rigidly excludes both creation and annihilation . . . . . the flux of power is eternally the same.*" Mr. Tyndall speaks here as though he were an Occultist. Yet, the *memento mori*,—"the Sun is cooling . . . it is dying! . . ." of the Western Trappists of Science resounds as loud as it ever did.

No, we say; no, while there is one man left on the globe, the sun will not be extinguished. Before the hour of the "Solar Pralaya" strikes on the watch-tower of Eternity, all the other worlds of our system will be gliding in their spectral shells along the silent paths of Infinite Space. Before it strikes, Atlas, the mighty Titan, the son of Asia and the nursling of Æther, will have dropped his heavy manvantaric burden and—died; the Pleiades, the bright seven Sis-

ters, will have upon awakening hiding Sterope to grieve with them —*to die themselves for their father's loss.* And, Hercules, *moving off his left leg,* will have to shift his place in heavens and erect his own funeral pile. Then only, surrounded by the fiery element breaking through the thickening gloom of the *Pralayan* twilight, will Hercules, *expiring amidst a general conflagration,* bring on likewise the death of our Sun: *he will have unveiled by moving off* the "CENTRAL SUN"—the mysterious, the ever-hidden centre of attraction of our Sun and System. Fables? Mere poetical fiction? Yet, when one knows that the most exact sciences, the greatest mathematical and astronomical truths went forth into the world among the *hoi polloi* sent out by the initiated priests, the Hierophants of the *sanctum sanctorum* of the old temples, under the guise of religious fables, it may not be amiss to search for universal truths even under the patches of fiction's harlequinade. This *fable* about the Pleiades, the *seven* Sisters, Atlas, and Hercules exists identical in subject, though under other names, in the sacred Hindu books, and has likewise the same occult meaning. But then like the *Ramayana* "borrowed from the Greek *Iliad*" and the Bhagavat-Gita and Krishna plagarized from the Gospel—in the opinion of the *great* Sanskritist, Prof. Weber, the Aryans may have also borrowed the Pleiades and their Hercules from the same source! When the Brahmins can be shown by the Christian Orientalists to be the direct descendants of the Teutonic Crusaders, then only, perchance, will the cycle of proofs be completed, and the historical truths of the West —vindicated!

---

## THROUGH THE VEIL

Our intuition is not so asleep as we think. It is shining in us all the time. If we will only remove the false conceptions which prevent us now from seeing, those of us who are operating on this side of the dark veil can draw that veil aside and let the light shine through.

—ROBERT CROSBIE

# *on the lookout*

*Critique of Science*

The disillusionment with Science, increasingly evident among even some scientists, goes much deeper than its failure to make good the promises of a better life, so optimistically predicted by nineteenth-century enthusiasts. Theodore Roszak, reviewing Jerome Ravetz's *Scientific Knowledge and its Social Problems* in the *Nation* (March 27), says of this book that it "deserves to stand for some time to come as one of the landmarks of the new critical spirit which is transforming science from within in ways whose political and cultural importance cannot be exaggerated." The reviewer points out that the main trouble is not that scientists have fallen prey to industrial and governmental manipulation, or that they have failed to maintain a position of "pure" disinterestedness, or even that they have refused to assume moral responsibility for the power they have made available. "The link between science and ethical responsibility," he says, "is more than sociological." Roszak finds this link "at the root of the scientific sensibility." Scientific responsibility stems, in fact, from the nature of man himself.

*A False "Objectivity"*

The mere attempt to eliminate human bias, in other words, is not sufficient, since it must be recognized that it is also the quality of being *human* that makes any such transcendence possible. Scientists are not able, even if they try, to separate themselves from what they do, to be wholly "objective," even in the laboratory. How, Roszak asks, does the moral neutrality of science obtain its justification? He replies:

> Because it [Science] is impersonal, involving no exercise of the self that must adjudicate between values. Inside their own heads and isolated from social repercussions, scientists are part of a nonnormative, purely rational relationship with natural phenomena which simply reflects things as they are or as they might

most accurately be construed in the form of a model. In the words of the Nobel laureate, E. B. Chain, "science, as long as it limits itself to the descriptive study of the laws of nature, has no moral or ethical quality." From this sense of scientific experience, it easily follows that scientists *as scientists* are wholly separate from scientists as citizens, husbands, wives, friends, ordinary human beings. Their research is not felt to be an act of the whole person, but of a selected portion of the self which has been trained in certain objectified methods of perception and intellection.

*"Psychological Distortion"*

This, I think, is the schizoid way in which most scientists still experience their own professional activity. It is certainly the way they tend to present themselves formally to their colleagues and to the world. Hence, the flat, non-idiosyncratic, self-effacing style of official "scientese" in papers and journals. But in fact this sense of their experience is a serious psychological distortion. It is a form of false consciousness, because it has lost its true personal resonance. As a result, it has created a discontinuity between the professional-epistemological and the social-evaluative aspects of science.

Dr. Ravetz maintains that there is a "submerged continuum that unites the professional and the social," and from this substratum comes the best of scientific creativity in the same way that a master of a craft expresses a knowledge that cannot be conveyed in words.

*Hidden Moral Factors*

Roszak continues:

With Polanyi, Ravetz emphasizes the many informal, judgmental activities that tacitly accompany all scientific research, requiring a constant, if normally subliminal exercise of taste, intuitive discretion, unspecifiable discrimination. While none of this is specifically ethical judgment, it is an activity of the same faculties upon which ethical decision draws. . . .

Ravetz properly insists that there is no way for scientists "to eliminate the elements of craft experience and personal wisdom" implicit in their work. But what they have done is to repress their awareness of how personality shapes mentality—and in this bad psychic habit there lies a lethal sanction for the alienated style and the moral vacuousness from which our civilization is dying. The scientist's act of knowing, as Charles Gillespie has commented, is "an act of alienation"—and more of that is not what the times require. As it is, the scientific universe in which we reside is a theatre of the absurd enlarged to cosmic dimensions.

*Modes of Indoctrination*

This fund of knowledge may also become the source of unconscious institutional bias:

> Few scientists ever learn their philosophy consciously. Rather they absorb it unwittingly from the design of curricula and textbooks. Or they find it baked into standard laboratory procedures and instruments (Ravetz is very good on this aspect of scientific "tools") or conveyed by the tone of professional journals. Above all, it rubs off on them from senior scientists who simply know what to approve and what to reject, what to encourage and what to ridicule in their students, and who wield the authority of a profession which can quickly weed out eccentrics. Here, at last, is where the "objectivity" of science is rooted: in the tightly knit consensus of the profession which effectively enforces its paradigms of research, its style of awareness, its metaphysical commitments—but does so unself-consciously.

*Trained Blindness*

> Thus, the product of a successful scientific education will be a student who has so deeply internalized the world view of science and the craft standards of his field that he will never be consciously aware of the judgments and evaluations he is making at every moment. While his thinking will be permeated by personal choice, he will not consciously experience it as such. The whole efficiency of science as a research machinery is based on the achievement of such a depersonalized sensibility, a quality of mind which—as a matter of professional respectability—can turn a blind eye to the philosophical foundations of thought, and which can therefore regard knowledge as something separate from wisdom. After all, think how difficult it might be for scientists to get beyond square one in their research if their education began with an unprejudiced discussion of Plato's Allegory of the Cave, or the Buddha's Diamond Sutra. Science, it has been said, progresses by sins of omission. Another way to put it might be that science advances over the dead body of philosophy—but only after having picked its pockets.

*Science No Longer Seems "True"*

Ravetz's solution is the cultivation of a group of socially conscious scientists who will commit their talents to arousing "public concern on matters of human welfare." But Roszak notes that Dr. Ravetz has some important doubts about this, and his reviewer plainly shares them:

> What if the appeal of science as a style of experience is on the wane—as I believe it is? What if, besides suffering corruption, science no longer seems to be true . . . or at least not true *enough*

to enough thoughtful people precisely because its truth is so narrowly based in the personality? The question is worth raising because it comes to the surface at several points in Ravetz's own thinking.

*"Other Sorts of Knowing"*

This is not a question of inevitable personal bias in judgment. It suggests that the acquisition of genuine scientific knowledge is the result of personal involvement of a very different order:

> Neither for Polanyi nor for Ravetz does the personal element in science imply that scientific knowledge is purely arbitrary. Neither works to a relativistic conclusion. Rather, Ravetz calls it a "paradox" that "objective, impersonal knowledge" can arise from "the subjective, intensely personal activity of creative scientific inquiry"—and a major part of his book is devoted to unscrambling that paradox. But I am not sure that he feels entirely secure about the conclusion he reaches, for around the margins of his thinking there appear amorphous little doubts about the adequacy of our science even as a valid natural philosophy. He remarks, for example, that science can only endure "as long as the framework of reality" surrounding it. . . . He speaks of the "limits of scientific knowledge" and suggests the possibility of "other sorts of knowing," mentioning especially the mystical insight of the alchemists and Taoist sages, and Plato's transcendent illumination. Obviously, to open oneself to these possibilities is to jeopardize the scientist's claim to definitive knowledge.

*Cost of Manipulative Skills*

Noting that these doubts are shared by younger scientists in increasing number, Roszak suggests that our conception of science has provided us with answers that are less than satisfactory because its intellectual base is not nearly inclusive enough:

> The alternative to regarding science as objective and definitive—even as a knowledge of nature—is not to call it arbitrary but to call it narrow. Science, I would suggest, presents us with the reality we apprehend when we organize an alienated mode of experience into a disciplined, collective form of inquiry. That mode of experience, as we have discovered over the past three centuries in the West, happens to provide us prodigiously with the means of short-term manipulation. But its price is high. It costs us the sacrifice of our psychic wholeness, our spiritual growth, our ecological wisdom. It costs us the capacity to see the world as preeminently a repository of *meanings*, rather than as a heap of facts. That is why, these days, the hunt is on for new modes of experiencing the self, others and the universe. Any progress we make in reclaiming the personal character of

scientific knowledge is apt to flow rapidly into that same unruly quest.

*Loss of "Clues"*

H.P.B. devoted a great deal of her *Secret Doctrine* and numerous articles to analyzing the scientific thought of her day. She shows that there was much that helped to extend men's mental horizons, but she found the inadequacies of modern science to be fundamental. In "Old Philosophers and Modern Critics" she wrote:

> Thus, if Theology has often disfigured ancient Theosophy, Modern Psychology and Modern Science have disfigured Ancient Philosophy. Both borrowed without any acknowledgement from the Ancient Wisdom and reviled and belittled it whenever they could. But, for lack of comprehension of the great philosophical and theosophical principles, the methods of Modern Science, however exact, must end in nullity. In no one branch can it demonstrate the origin and ultimate of things. Instead of tracing the effect from its primal source, its progress is the reverse. Its higher types, it teaches, are all evolved from antecedent lower ones. It starts from the bottom of the cycle, led on step by step in the great labyrinth of Nature, by a thread of Matter. As soon as this breaks, the clue is lost, and it recoils in affright from the Incomprehensible, and confesses itself powerless. Not so did Plato and his disciples. With them, as with us, *the lower types were but the concrete images of the higher abstract types.*

*Reasons for Ancient Reticence*

In answer to the common argument that the ancients knew little of the facts of exact science with which we have been able to do so much, H.P.B. reminds her readers that among ancient peoples much instruction took place within the mysteries and was imparted under solemn oath of secrecy. This makes it difficult to assess with any certainty the extent of their knowledge. That the purpose of this secrecy was not to withhold knowledge but to preserve it intact, perhaps through a period of mental darkness, is suggested in the same article:

> Plato is declared by his various commentators to have been utterly ignorant of the uses of the nerves for conveying sensations; and to have had nothing better to offer than vain speculations concerning physiological questions. He has simply generalized the divisions of the human body, they say, and given nothing reminding us of anatomical facts. As to his own views on the human frame, the Microcosmos being, in his mind, the image in miniature of the Macrocosmos, they are much too

transcendental to obtain the least attention from our exact and materialistic sceptics. The idea of this frame being formed out of triangles, like the universe, seems preposterously ridiculous to several of his translators. . . .

*Terms Unimportant*

If, instead of quarreling with the insufficiency and at times the absence of strictly scientific terms and definitions in Plato's works, we analyze them carefully, the *Timaeus* alone will be found to contain within its limited space the germs of every new discovery. The circulation of the blood and the law of gravitation are clearly mentioned, though the former fact, it may be, is not so clearly defined as to withstand the reiterated attacks of Modern Science; for, according to Prof. Jowett, the specific discovery that the blood flows out from one side of the heart through the arteries, and returns to the other through the veins, was unknown to him, though Plato was perfectly aware "that blood is a fluid in constant motion."

*Time for a Change?*

Mr. Roszak concludes his review of Dr. Ravetz's book on a note which seems to embody the genuine scientific spirit:

Those who feel that the scientific style of consciousness is now losing its influence as the dominant reality-maker are, I think, right. It is just as stultifying to go on too long experiencing the world in one narrow way as to go on forever painting pictures in one restricted way. Over the next few generations, science may well disintegrate amid its own self-doubt, subtle corruptions and demoralization—and especially because it fails, on *principle,* to supply the desperate need for meaning and wisdom. But our science is only one of many possible natural philosophies. Beyond it, others beckon.

*"Continental Drift"*

An article in the Los Angeles *Times* (Feb. 27) declares that at last the "century-old 'continental drift' theory has been proven." M. N. A. Peterson, manager of the Deep Sea Drilling Project which is under the direction of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, is quoted extensively. The theory of "continental drift" is very old and must have been developed "soon after good maps of the world appeared." "The continents," the *Times* writer says, "are like pieces in a puzzle, with South America fitting up against Africa and North America up against Africa and Europe." This theory was "popular in pseudo-scientific writing," but there was no explanation of *how* the continents separated, which resulted in skep-

ticism on the part of most geologists. The "orthodox" teaching in geological text books has been that the continents and ocean beds, the essential "highs" and "lows," have always been the same. There may have been erosion and rebuilding, but the general areas were considered to be basically stable.

*Earth's Polarity*

Today, the *Times* article points out, the majority of the scientific community accept the "continental drift" theory though differing on details.

This change has been brought about by recent investigative work by geologists and geophysicists. It is now believed by the majority of geophysicists that the magnetic fields of the earth have reversed themselves many times, with the comment that no one knows why.

Investigations of the paleomagnetism of rocks also give evidence that there have been large-scale movement of the rocks on the ocean floor. These studies, along with the measurement of sediment thicknesses, which indicate the age of the underlying rock (sediments accumulate at a predictable rate), led to the conclusion that the ocean floor is spreading at a rate of from three to four centimeters a year. This may give support to the "continental drift" theory. In any event it does add a mechanism to a venerable and complex developmental process of the physical world.

*A Vital Process?*

H.P.B. stated repeatedly that "scientific facts" of one period would likely be refuted or reversed by later findings. The reversal of the magnetic poles was only to be laughed at in "respectable" scientific circles when she stated this to be a fact a hundred years ago. Also, the continents were confidently looked upon as "eternal" land masses—until geologists tried to explain the discovery of sea fossils in the highest mountain ranges. Of course, lost continents such as Atlantis and Lemuria are still *terra incognita* to scientific geology, but the evidence for these now submerged land bodies continues to accumulate, and will one day be recognized.

Whatever the complete explanation of land and sea floor movements, such research will help to break down rigid preconceptions regarding the ancient history of man and the nature of the earth. Further, the undersea movements have confirmed the possibility that the earth, too, is still in the process of evolution. But yet to be

explored is the origin of the force that causes the ocean floor to spread. A clue might be found in the fact, mentioned by H.P.B., that the ancient peoples spoke of the earth as a living animal. This would suggest that all earth movements have their origin in forces that pervade it as life does any entity, in rhythmic patterns.

*Truth in Allegory*

Another allegory referred to by her in *The Secret Doctrine* (II, 252) suggests that the investigators in ancient times possessed an insight into geologic facts the subtlety of which their modern counterparts are just beginning to become aware of. She says:

> Even what appears to be the, on the face of it, perfectly nonsensical allegory of Brahmâ assuming the form of a Boar to rescue the Earth from under the waters, finds in the Secret Commentaries a perfectly scientific explanation, relating as it does to the many risings and sinkings, and the constant alternation of water and land from the earliest to the latest geological periods of our globe; for Science teaches us now that nine-tenths of the stratified formations of the earth's crust have been gradually constructed beneath water, at the bottom of the seas.

*Variable Constant?*

According to *Science News* (Jan. 8), astronomers have again revised the Hubble constant, a ratio by which the age and size of the bodies constituting our universe have been calculated for some fifty years. This constant has long been a matter of dispute, however, because it does not entirely account for all the factors of measurement. A new criterion for measuring cosmic distances, developed by the researches of George O. Abell of the University of California at Los Angeles, and thought to be more accurate, would alter the value of the Hubble constant considerably. It would nearly double the size and, in consequence, the age of the universe, according to Dr. Abell.

Parenthetically, *Science News* makes a provocative observation regarding the achievement of more accurate estimates of cosmic conditions in general:

> The Hubble constant is a constant for galaxies fairly near to us, the observations of which represent a situation that is more or less contemporary with us in cosmological terms. At the edges of the observed universe we are seeing things as they appeared billions of years ago. In those days the Hubble constant may have been different.

*Dispute as to "Curvature"*

Further comment reminds the reader that the basic contribution of scientists is the daring to maintain an open mind:

> The space of the universe is supposed to be curved, and whether that curvature is open (the three-dimensional analogue of a curve like a hyperbola) or closed (the three-dimensional analogue of a circle) is a matter of dispute. Temporal changes in the Hubble constant depend on the curvature. Abell and Lura Pat Bautz of Northwestern University and W. E. Morgan of the Yerkes Observatory have begun a study of the velocity-distance relation for the most distant galaxy clusters. So far they have found such a wide scatter of data that they cannot say the data favor one or the other possibility. But this itself is significant, says Abell, because earlier attempts to determine the universal curvature all came out on the closed side. This one would allow the open curvature equal possibility.

*Differentiated Elements*

The prospect that currently observed conditions differ from those of distant times and places is corroborated by H.P.B. in *The Secret Doctrine*. She says:

> . . . differentiated as may have been those simple chemical atoms—which archaic philosophy called "the creators of their respective Parents," fathers, brothers, husbands of their mothers, and those mothers the daughters of their own sons, like Aditi and Daksha, for example—differentiated as these elements were in the beginning, still, they were not the compound bodies known to science, as they are now. Neither Water, Air, Earth (synonym for solids generally) existed in their present form, representing the three states of matter alone recognized by Science; for all these are the productions already recombined by the atmospheres of globes completely formed—even to fire—so that in the first periods of the earth's formation they were something quite *sui generis*. Now that the conditions and laws ruling our solar system are fully developed; and that the atmosphere of our earth, as of every other globe, has become, so to say, a crucible of its own, Occult Science teaches that there is a perpetual exchange taking place in space of molecules, or of atoms rather, correlating, and thus changing their combining equivalents on every planet. . . .

*Variable Properties*

> The scale of temperature, from the highest degree to the lowest that can be conceived of, may be imagined to be one and the same in and for the whole Universe; nevertheless, its properties, other than those of dissociation and re-association, differ

on every planet; and thus atoms enter into new forms of existence, undreamt of, and incognizable to, physical Science. As already expressed in "Five Years of Theosophy," the essence of Cometary matter, for instance, "is totally different from any of the chemical or physical characteristics with which the greatest chemists and physicists of the earth are acquainted" (p. 242). And even that matter, during rapid passage through our atmosphere, undergoes a certain change in its nature. Thus not alone the elements of our planets, but even those of all its sisters in the Solar System, differ as widely from each other in their combinations, as from the Cosmic elements beyond our Solar limits. Therefore, they cannot be taken as a standard for comparison with the same in other worlds (I, 142-43).

*Important Correction*

An unfortunate error occurred in the reprinting of H. P. Bla vatsky's article, "The Theosophical Society: Its Mission and It Future" in the pamphlet, *Theosophy and the Theosophical Move ment.* In the last paragraph of the article, the word "Buddhism" i the phrase "esoteric Buddhism" should have been spelled with on "d" only: "Budhism." The reason for this spelling is clearly ex plained early in the first volume of *The Secret Doctrine* (p. xvii Introductory). The word appeared correctly in the original publica tion of the article in *Lucifer.*